

#38  
Dmt  
7-31-03

### Interview Summary

Application No.

09/150,813

Applicant(s)

GRAINGER ET AL.

Examiner

Joseph F Murphy

Art Unit

1646

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Joseph F Murphy.

(3) Jan Embretson.

(2) David Grainger.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 30 July 2003.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Identification of prior art discussed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The inventor discussed the role of leukocyte infiltration in the pathophysiology of the indications encompassed by the claims. The nexus between the identification of populations at risk for development of leukocyte infiltration and pathologies resulting from such infiltration were discussed with regard to the 112 first paragraph rejection over the prevention of indications. Issues regarding the scope of enablement for claims that encompass chemokine induced pathologies not related to leukocyte infiltration were discussed .